

## REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the final Office Action mailed March 17, 2009. The Examiner is thanked for agreeing to a telephonic interview on April 7, 2009. During the interview the Examiner and Applicant discussed Rekimoto in general and how the Examiner believed Rekimoto related to the claims. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 21-31 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action.

The specification has been amended to explicitly identify items numbered in the original drawings. The amendments made to the specification introduce no new matter.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 31 have been amended. New Claim 32 is added. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as filed at least in Figures 4-6 and paragraphs [0008], [0017], [0020]-[0021], [0024]-[0025], [0030]-[0037] and [0040] and the claims as originally filed. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 21-32 remain outstanding. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 21-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Rekimoto (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0044858 A1) (hereinafter Rekimoto).

Claims 1, 5 and 31 have been amended. Claim 1 includes the limitations “wherein the gesture is made with a flick which indicates content to be moved and a direction without designating the destination”. Claim 5 includes the limitations “wherein the move gesture initiates propagation of content from right to left which indicates content to be moved and a direction without designating the destination”. Claim 31 includes the limitations “an input device that receives input of a gesture to move a content from a first display of the plurality of displays, wherein the gesture is a movement from right to left using a finger, wherein the movement from right to left specifies a starting point and a direction”. Rekimoto requires the specification of both a starting point and an ending point to move content. In contrast, in an embodiment Applicant’s invention uses a flick gesture, move gesture or a gesture which specifies a starting point and direction of movement without indicating an end point. Since Rekimoto does not disclose these limitations, it does not anticipate Claims 1, 5 and 31.

Claims 2-4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 21-30 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 1 and 5, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claims 1 and 5 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the §102 rejections.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 17, 2009

By: /Anthony G. Craig/  
Anthony G. Craig  
Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928  
Customer No. 23910